DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 198 131 SP 017 540

AUTHOR Koll, Patricia J.; Herzog, Barbara J.
TITLE Collaborative Governance in a Preservice/Inservice Center.
PUB DATE Dec 80
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of States on Inservice Education (San Diego, CA, December, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College School Cooperation; *Cooperating Teachers; Governance; Individual Needs; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Peer Teaching; Postsecondary Education; Preservice Teacher Education; Staff Development; Student Teachers; *Student Teacher Supervisors; *Teacher Centers; *Teacher Motivation

ABSTRACT

A description is given of a Preservice/Inservice Center, collaboratively developed by a public school system and a university. The primary purposes of the Center were the following: (1) clustering student teachers to facilitate economy of supervision; (2) implementing an inservice design in which experienced teachers shared the supervision of student teachers with cooperating teachers and university supervisors; and (3) measuring the Center's impact on motivational patterns of inservice teachers. While there appeared to be no significant increase in the intrinsic motivation levels of the inservice teachers who participated, it was concluded that combining preservice with inservice operations tends to provide some motivational impetus for growth for all participants. It was also concluded that peer inservice, in which teachers share and provide mutual assistance to each other, tends to be more effective than using resource persons external to the staff. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED198131

COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE IN A PRESERVICE/INSERVICE CENTER

By

Patricia J. Koll
University of Wisconsin
Oshkosh, Wisconsin

and

Barbara J. Herzog
Fond du Lac Public Schools
Fond du Lac, Wisconsin

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Patricia J. Koll

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP 017540

* A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of States on Inservice Education, San Diego, California, December, 1980.

A B S T R A C T

A Preservice/Inservice Center, collaboratively developed and implemented between Fond du Lac Public Schools and The University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh, will be described. The Center operated in 1978-79, with a follow-up mini-center in 1979-80. The Center concept was initiated by the university but the development and implementation of it resulted from collaborative decision-making.

The purposes of the Center emerged from independent as well as mutual needs of the two institutions. Among the primary purposes were the following:

A. Clustering of student teachers to facilitate economy of supervision while simultaneously providing them with a superior terminal experience.

B. Implementing a peer-inservice design that would serve the entire school's staff and satisfy district, building, and personal/professional needs.

C. Measuring a Preservice/Inservice Center's impact on motivational patterns of inservice teachers.

A junior high teacher served as both the on-site preservice supervisor for student teachers and the inservice coordinator for the school staff. A local university provided supervisory and consultant services. Decisions about the extent and nature of peer inservice activities were made collaboratively between the junior high teacher who served as the inservice agent, the principal of the junior high, and the university consultant (the Director of the university's Professional Development Center). The research component of the project was conducted by the university with the approval of district administrators.

The Center operation focused primarily on impacting teacher motivation for professional growth. The developers hypothesized that a significant rise in motivation level would occur in the "experimental" school while that of the "control" school would remain constant. The subjects of the study

consisted of approximately 40 teachers in the "experimental" junior high (in which the preservice/inservice center was located) and an equal number in the "control" junior high in the Fond du Lac School District. A pre-test involving use of a survey instrument extrapolated from the Maslow-Porter motivation ladder was administered in both schools. The staff of the "experimental" school was then involved in the operation of a peer-led and university-supported Preservice/ Inservice Center. Involvement with student teachers and with a sequence of professional growth experiences was a major thrust of the Center concept. No such activities and collaboration with university representatives occurred in the "control" school. The survey instrument was again administered as a post-test. In view of the nonparametric nature of the data, Mann-Whitney U Test Analysis was employed to test for significance of difference between median levels of motivation on both pre-test and post-test for each school as well as between schools. The findings may bear important implications for Preservice/ Inservice Center design and, more generally, for staff development programs.

COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE IN A PRESERVICE/INSERVICE CENTER

With staff development assuming increased importance among the professions, educators are among those accepting the challenge and responsibility of improving the performance of those already in practice. The changed market in the educational arena has resulted in comparatively little "new blood" entering the profession. Most public and private schools are faced with the reality of attaining or maintaining a dynamic program with staffs already in place. That may be the circumstance for some time to come. In view of that reality, far more serious and sophisticated efforts have gone into program planning for staff development of inservice educators.

A key factor wherever the learning of new ideas, skills, or attitudes takes place is motivation. Whether the learner is a child, adolescent, or adult, the smorgasbord of psychological learning truths that have evolved places great importance on those conditions which appear to cause the learner to <u>want</u> to learn that which is intended. Those who bear the responsibility for designing staff development programs need to consider the motivational structures of their adult learners.

In the past, teachers have participated in inservice education largely as the result of an administrative requirement or the lure of earning credits towards advancing on a salary schedule. Both of these traditional motivators are extrinsic in nature. Often, they were ineffective in bringing about a lasting change in teaching behavior. The Rand Study of federal programs which supported educational change reported critical factors for effecting lasting change (McLaughlin and Marsh, 1978). There was clear evidence that approaches based on intrinsic motivation were comparatively more effective and well worth pursuing.

As a result of this concern for the motivational component of staff development for teachers, and encouraged by reports of peer inservice in the literature (Zenke, 1976; Lawrence and Branch, 1978; Martin, 1979) and by calls for collaboration, the College of Education and Human Services at the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh in collaboration with the Fond du Lac Public Schools developed and implemented a Preservice/Inservice Center during Spring, 1979. Due to declining numbers of preservice teachers, a scaled down version of the Center was implemented in Spring, 1980. The research reported in this paper focused on assessing the impact of the Center on teacher motivation for professional development.

Initiating the Preservice/Inservice Center Concept

The Preservice/Inservice Center concept was initiated by Patricia Koll, the Director of the Professional Development Center at the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh. This staff development specialist, and the College of Education and Human Services Director of Field Experiences, together, approached the Superintendent and the Director of Personnel of the Fond du Lac Public Schools. The two institutions are located approximately 22 miles apart. The Preservice/Inservice Center concept was explained, and discussions included the school site and personnel to be directly involved with the Center. An agreement was reached to have Barbara Herzog, an exemplary teacher and a member of the district's inservice council, serve as the focal point for the Center's operation.

Follow-up meetings were held involving Herzog, the principal of the junior high in which she taught, Koll, the university student teaching supervisor, and the Superintendent. These discussions further refined the Center concept and clarified the purposes of the Center:

1) Clustering of student teachers to facilitate economy of supervision while simultaneously providing them with a superior terminal experience.

2) Implementing a peer-inservice design that would serve the entire school's staff and satisfy district, building, and personal/ professional needs.

3) Measuring a Preservice/Inservice Center's impact on motivational patterns of inservice teachers.

Discussions also clarified the roles of the key persons to be involved with the Center operation: Herzog, Koll, the building principal, and the university student teaching supervisor. Parameters for the Center's operation were also determined. Distributions of decision-making power and authority were discussed and agreed upon.

At a later date, Koll and the university supervisor addressed a faculty meeting in the "Center" school to explain the Center concept that would be implemented the coming semester. The only piece of information withheld was the nature of the research study to be conducted as a component of the Center experience. Then university representatives assured all those present that nothing would be done as a part of the Center operation without the prior approval of the building principal and/or their appropriate district personnel. The governance of the Center throughout would be collaborative.

Prior to the actual implementation of the Center, a pre-test involving the use of a survey instrument extrapolated from the Maslow/Porter motivation ladder was administered to approximately 40 teachers in School A (the Center school) and in School B (a comparable junior high) in January, 1979. The pre-test was supplied by Koll and was administered by the respective building principals. The form (Appendix A, Job Preference Questionnaire) was designed to assess the motivational levels in job performance of the teacher-respondents. The investigators hypothesized that a significant rise in motivational level would occur in School A as a result of the Center operation there; in addition,

that motivational levels would remain the same in School B. A study done in Virginia (Duncan, 1978) with experienced teachers enrolled in graduate reading courses used an instrument based on Maslow's hierarchy of needs to determine teacher need structure. It was concluded that the opinionnaire was able to indicate distinct motivational directions for most subjects.

A Description of the Preservice/Inservice Center

Following the pre-test, a Preservice/Inservice Center was established in School A, with Herzog bearing primary responsibility as both preservice supervisor and inservice coordinator/provider in her building. A team of six student teachers from UW-Oshkosh was assigned to Herzog and gradually assumed increasing responsibility for teaching all of Herzog's classes. The six student teachers met daily for planning sessions during the cooperating teacher's preparation period. The six were divided into teams for both teaching and planning. Teams consisted of 2-3 student teachers. Each student teacher was also required to do individual planning and teaching of a unit of at least two weeks in length. The cooperating teacher also served as a team member, as well as a supervisor who observed and conferenced with each one individually at least once per week. Some student teachers were seen two or more times per week. Much supervisory time was also spent in planning, offering suggestions, etc. (Comprised of only two preservice teachers, the 1980 preservice team had fewer opportunities for varied experiences, and the team operation was generally less flexible. As a result, inservice education opportunities were also fewer.)

Each student teacher (1979) taught in both major and minor fields. This was accomplished by other social studies teachers offering at least one of their classes to be taught by a student teacher. After they had defined the

content, the student teacher prepared a complete unit under the direction of the cooperating teacher. The unit had to meet her approval as well as that of the classroom teacher before the first lesson was taught. The cooperating teacher observed the student teachers in these other classrooms also. Each student teacher thus worked with at least two regular classroom teachers.

All units, both those done in teams and individually, prepared by the student teachers were run off and distributed to each student teacher and to each social studies teacher in the building. This served as one method of sharing newer ideas with experienced teachers.

Each student teacher had an extracurricular assignment. These ranged from homeroom (study hall supervision) to forensics work to lunchroom supervision to coaching.

In the 1979 Center, a university supervisor spent a minimum of a half-day a week at the school to share preservice supervisory responsibilities. Based on this opportunity as well as others, Herzog devoted approximately one day per week to providing informal, low inference, non-threatening assistance to inservice teachers. (Time devoted to inservice education was cut in half in 1980 since the university supervisor was on-site much less frequently.) Most staff development was personalized and done on a one-to-one or small group basis. The university's inservice/continuing education coordinator, Koll, served as a consultant for the staff development operation. Koll suggested a survey of the staff to determine specific types of inservice education interests.

The assumptions which guided the Center operation were similar to those which guided the Mill Valley (Martin, 1979) program:

1. Teachers want to improve themselves professionally.
2. Teachers must have a large degree of self-determination in deciding on the particular form of inservice education they will pursue.

3. In spite of the need for teacher self-determination, external facilitation by school administration is necessary for useful inservice opportunities to become available.

4. As inservice leaders, teachers with proven skill have high credibility among other teachers.

5. A formal presentation of new teaching techniques, including theory, demonstration, and practice, has no lasting implementation value without opportunity for personalized follow-up assistance at the school site.

(p. 2)

Among the activities and approaches incorporated into the peer-led program for staff development were the following:

1. Scheduling of preservice teachers to team-plan and/or team-teach with inservice teachers in their major and minor areas.

2. Securing of supplementary materials from the university's EMC for use by teachers in School A.

3. Herzog's observation of inservice teachers, with pre and post conferences (low inference in nature).

4. Videotaping of inservice teachers, with pre and post conferencing (low inference in nature).

5. Training sessions on the improvement of questioning skills.

6. Goal setting for professional growth, Herzog serving as peer-consultant.

7. Training sessions on the implementation of reading strategies in the content areas.

8. "Rap" sessions about concerns and problems during preparation periods.

9. Training sessions in values education.

10. Teaching of university course, Reading Strategies 5-12, on-site (1979 only).

11. Training sessions on supervision of instruction for those working with preservice teachers.

12. Distribution of "items of interest" in staff mailboxes as vehicles for professional growth (Appendix B).

Most of the above approaches lent themselves to one-to-one or small group formats. There were occasional sessions where representatives from two or

more departments gathered for a particular purpose; e.g., to learn the Cloze procedure for matching students and print materials. Most of the training sessions were scheduled during preparation periods or before the start of the school day. In the 1980 Center, a two-session inservice program on professional burnout and self-renewal was arranged and opened up to other district staff, a result of a district-wide needs assessment. Most, if not all, of the inservice activity done by Herzog in both Centers responded to needs data gathered formally or informally. Suggestions for activities were frequently made by Koll.

Periodic conferences were held involving Herzog, Koll, and the building principal to assess the Center operation. Decisions were made collaboratively which determined new directions for the Center. One result of these conferences was an expansion of Herzog's role.

Following the termination of the preservice/inservice center at semester's end (1979), a post-test was administered in both schools by the respective building principals. The same instrument as in the pre-test was used (Appendix A).

The data from pre-test and post-test were tabulated by a graduate assistant and a secretary, and in view of the nonparametric nature of the data (i.e., data were not equal interval in nature, nor was there homogeneity of variance within the distribution of scores), Mann-Whitney U Test Analysis was employed to test for: (1) significance of difference between median levels of motivation between Schools A and B on pre-test; (2) significance of difference between median levels of motivation between Schools A and B on post-test; (3) significance of difference between median levels of motivation between pre-test and post-test in School A; and (4) significance of difference between median levels of motivation between pre-test and post-test in School B.*

*The investigators wish to acknowledge the assistance of Dr. Thomas Gans, Director of Field Experience and Related Research, COEHS, UW-O, in completing the statistical analysis of the data.

Results

The project sought to assess the impact of a peer-led staff development design on teacher level of motivation for professional development. All of the data presented in the following discussion relates to the 1979 Center. Table 1 presents the Mann-Whitney U Test data analysis when comparing pre-test values between Schools A and B.

TABLE 1

PRE-TEST MANN-WHITNEY U ANALYSIS, SCHOOLS A AND B

Level	Sum of Ranks (a)	n_a	n_b	U.	z		Result
I	1033.5	36	36	928.5	3.16	$p<.001$	$Md_a > Md_b$
II	1172.5	36	36	789.5	1.59	$p<.06$	?
III	1133	36	36	829	2.04	$p<.03$	$Md_a > Md_b$
IV	1639	36	36	323	-3.66	$p<.001$	$Md_a < Md_b$
V	1461.5	36	36	500.5	-1.66	$p<.05$	$Md_a < Md_b$

Table 2 presents the Mann-Whitney U Test data analysis when comparing post-test values between Schools A and B.

TABLE 2

POST-TEST MANN-WHITNEY U ANALYSIS, SCHOOLS A AND B

Level	Sum of Ranks (a)	n_a	n_b	U.	z		Result
I	1011.5	37	26	653.5	2.41	$p<.01$	$Md_a > Md_b$
II	1091	37	26	574	1.30	$p<.10$	?
III	1122.5	37	26	542.5	0.86	$p<.20$	?
IV	1370.5	37	26	294.5	-2.60	$p<.01$	$Md_a < Md_b$
V	1344	37	26	321	-2.23	$p<.02$	$Md_a < Md_b$

Table 3 presents the Mann-Whitney U Test data analysis when comparing pre- and post-test values in School A.

TABLE 3

PRE-TEST/POST-TEST MANN-WHITNEY U ANALYSIS, SCHOOL A

Level	Sum of Ranks (2)	n_1	n_2	U.	z		Result
I	1364	36	37	671	0.06	$p < .50$	no change
II	1319	36	37	716	0.55	$p < .30$	no change
III	1434.5	36	37	600.5	-0.72	$p < .25$	no change
IV	1301.5	36	37	733.5	0.75	$p < .25$	no change
V	1491.5	36	37	543.5	-1.35	$p < .10$	?

Table 4 presents the Mann-Whitney U Test data analysis when comparing pre- and post-test values in School B.

TABLE 4

PRE-TEST/POST-TEST MANN-WHITNEY U ANALYSIS, SCHOOL B

Level	Sum of Ranks (2)	n_1	n_2	U.	z		Result
I	814.5	36	26	472.5	0.06	$p < .50$	no change
II	813.5	36	26	473.5	0.08	$p < .50$	no change
III	811	36	26	476	0.11	$p < .50$	no change
IV	861	36	26	426	-0.60	$p < .30$	no change
V	869.5	36	26	417.5	-0.72	$p < .25$	no change

Discussion

The resulting data and their analyses do not support the investigators' hypothesis that there would be a significant increase in motivation levels in School A. The data do support the corollary hypothesis that motivation levels in School B would show no significant change.

Despite the obvious difference in sample size in School B (pre=n of 36; post=n of 26), there are no discernible differences in the median scores on any of the five levels between the pre-test and post-test. Similarly, the median scores for School A appear to be stable on the first four levels, with that on the fifth showing indications of lower ranking on the second administration, but not to the usual level of statistical significance. It is possible that teacher's concerns about level five (security) eased somewhat during the staff development operation.

In comparing the two schools, on the pre-test the faculty of School A rated levels I (self-actualization) and III (esteem) higher than did the faculty of School B, and they rated levels IV (affiliation) and V (security) lower than did the School B faculty. This follows from the fact that the levels are not independent; a higher rating on one level necessitates a lower rating of another. The differences between the schools remained on the post-test, with the exception of the difference in ratings of level III (esteem), which faded into non-significance. A nearly significant difference on level II (autonomy) remained in the same gray area on the post-test, possible but not sufficiently probable for a clear judgement.

Although the profile comparison in School A does reveal a slight (although not statistically significant) shift to higher medians in the higher motivation levels, it may be that a more dramatic increase was improbable in view of the profile already skewed towards levels I and II. Had the pre-test data revealed fewer observations of high motivation levels in job performance, there may have been greater opportunity to observe significant changes in relationship (causal or casual) to the operation of the Preservice/Inservice Center.

Perhaps the fundamental issue to be raised in view of the resulting data deals with the nature of the instrument administered as both pre- and

post-test. It may well be that the investigators measured accurately the wrong thing! The items on the instrument may reflect fairly stable philosophical/motivational preferences which would be relatively impervious to direct manipulation, especially over a short time perspective, as in the staff development operation. They may be expressions of fairly constant personality traits. The intrinsic motivation for professional growth that was the focus of this study may, instead, be a more ephemeral state of mind which this particular instrument may not have assessed. Atkinson's discussion of achievement motivation (1966) distinguishes relatively general and stable individual differences in personality ("motives") from more specific and transient environmental factors ("expectations" and "incentive values"). The instrument used in this study may have assessed "motives" rather than "expectations" and "incentive values".

Other Findings

Research design does not generally allow for measuring and reporting results of a subjective nature. In the case of the Center, the investigators feel that these results are too important to withhold. These findings may hold greater significance for the practitioner.

Koll, Herzog, and school administrators and supervisors observed many positive results which were directly related to the Preservice/Inservice Center. In a final evaluation conference, the district administrative team declared the Center a success even without seeing the objective data generated by the testing. They extended an invitation to the university to continue this collaborative effort in the future. The 1980 Center was a result of this invitation for continued collaboration. Discussions were also held involving Fond du Lac district administrators and university representatives regarding

the establishment of a Preservice/Inservice Center to focus on mainstreaming. School closings, staff transfers, and other circumstances precluded implementation of such Center at this time.

Three teachers who allowed themselves to be videotaped for the first time since beginning their teaching in School A all agreed that the experience was beneficial to them in improving instruction in their respective classes. They have since requested follow-up videotaping. The videotaping was done by Herzog and included pre and post conferences with each teacher, following a clinical supervision format.

One veteran teacher who expressed an interest in teaching reading skill development in his content area was given assistance by Herzog. As a result of the peer teaming, the teacher revised all of his units for the remainder of the second semester to incorporate his new skills. Long-time teaching strategies of a traditional nature were extensively revised and his whole curriculum took on a new structure and approach. The teacher noted that increases in student achievement were likely a reflection of his changed teaching behavior.

One teacher had responded very facetiously to a requirement during the semester that each teacher write a goal for professional improvement. After Herzog's working with this teacher over a concern about reading in the curriculum his attitude toward the goal-writing became supportive, and he met with the principal to replace his initial goal with one dealing with reading skill development.

The Center allowed Herzog opportunities to interact professionally with teachers in a supportive atmosphere that helped generate mutual respect as well as concern for professional growth, an occurrence all too rare, particularly in a self-contained setting. Moreover, the motivation for professional

development was enhanced by scheduling most of the inservice activities during the school day. Critical considerations for peer inservice programs appear to include the convenient scheduling of activities as well as the mutual respect among staff and the acceptance of the peer inservice agent.

Conclusions and Implications

The study undertaken by the investigators corroborates many of the conclusions about the professional growth of inservice teachers determined in other studies. Among the more emphatic ideas are the following:

1. Motivation for professional growth is most effective when it is intrinsic. (Baden, 1976; Hoyt and Howard, 1977; Owens, 1977; Jabker and Halinski, 1977; Martin, 1979)

2. Peer inservice in which teachers share and provide mutual assistance to each other tends to be more effective than using resource persons external to the staff. (Lawrence, et al., 1974; Zenke, 1976; Googins, 1978; Martin, 1979)

3. Faculty who make the greatest gains in growth tend to be those who are motivated to change and who have the services of an "expert" to assist them. (Hoyt and Howard, 1977; Owens, 1977)

4. Combining preservice with inservice operations in a school tends to provide motivational impetus for growth in both preservice and inservice teachers. (Krathwohl, 1978)

5. Participation in professional growth activities that are self-determined and individualized results in greater commitment to growth and changes in practices. (Donald, 1975)

6. Staff development programs that emphasize demonstrations, supervised trials and feedback are more likely to accomplish their objectives than are programs in which the teacher-recipient is passive. (Lawrence, et al., 1974)

7. Collaboration is not mere cooperation or a matter of good will, but an agreed-upon distribution of power, status, and authority. (Weaver, 1979)

References

Atkinson, J. W. and Feather, N. T. A theory of achievement motivation. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

Baden, D. Developing and implementing teacher directed professional development model. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, 1976.

Donald, J. When pretesting becomes diagnosis: Making individualized instruction more personal. Paper presented to the National Society for Performance and Instruction, 1975.

Duncan, P. Teacher need-structure and instructional preference in reading; A pilot study. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference, 1978.

Googins, R. C. Practical constraints on secondary school content area reading programs. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Reading Association, 1978.

Hoyt, D. and Howard, G. The evaluation of faculty development programs: Research report #39. Kansas State University: Office of Educational Research, 1977.

Jabker, E. and Halinski, R. Instructional development and faculty rewards. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association, 1977.

Krathwohl, D. R. Inservice education: Theory practice and policy. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, 1978.

Lawrence, G., et al. Patterns of effective inservice education. Florida Department of Education, 1974.

Lawrence, G. and Branch, J. Peer support system as the heart of inservice education. Theory into Practice, 1978, 17, 245-7.

Martin, D. S. Inservice with a difference: A teacher-to-teacher model. The Developer, May, 1979, 1-3.

McLaughlin, M. and Marsh, D. Staff development and school change. Teachers College Record, 1978, LXXX, 69-94.

Owens, R. E. Elevating the importance of teaching: National Project III. Kansas State University: Office of Educational Improvement and Instruction, 1977.

Weaver, J. F. Collaboration: Why is sharing the turf so difficult? The Journal of Teacher Education, January-February 1979, 30, 24-25.

Zenke, L. L. Staff development in Florida. Educational Leadership, 1976, 34, 177-181.